

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office action of Examiner Jack P. Nguyen of 24 Nov 2004, designated non-final.

Claims 1-106 are in the case, none as yet allowed.

35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-12, 17-20, 22-43, 48-82, 87-99, and 104-106 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Boe et al. 6,122,276 (Boe hereafter).

Boe is distinguished from applicants invention in that Boe has an additional level of indirection not found in applicants claims.

Specifically, Boe has a TN3270 client (Fig. 1, element 13), a TN 3270 server (Fig. 1, element 18) and also a legacy Host (Fig. 1, element 12). This means that Boe has communication between the TN3270 client and the TN3270

server (as do applicants), but he also has communication between the TN3270 server and the legacy Host (also like applicants, but applicants claims are not directed to this level of communication.)

This distinction is important, for the negotiations and communications of interest in Boe occur between the TN3270 server and the legacy Host. Applicants have no comparable level of communication, for all negotiations and communications of interest in applicants' claims occur between applicants client (such as a TN5250 client) and server (such as a TN5250 server).

Specifically, the confirmation record payload represented by applicants' claimed invention (Figure 2, block 122) gets returned by applicants (TN5250) server (Fig. 3, server 42) to applicants (TN5250) client (Fig. 3, client 40).

Thus, when applicants describe passing back information in a confirmation record to applicants' client, this information is actually communicated to the TN5250 client (Fig. 3, client 40). In Boe's case, this information is communicated from the legacy Host to the TN3270 server, and

it does not continue on to the actual TN3270 client.

The significance of this distinction is that the TN3270 client of Boe is not actually involved in any of the negotiations specified in applicants' claims. In other words, the actual TN3270 client is not able to act on any information from the "confirmation record", such that it could, for example, do retry processing using a different set of negotiation variables, or taking corrective actions based upon the error code returned in the confirmation record.

The goal of Boe is to enable the legacy Host to track clients (Col. 7, lines 8-12) by processing in the TN3270 server (called the "communications gateway" in his claims), Applicants invention is distinct in that it seeks to enable programmable negotiations by the client.

Turning now to applicants' claim 1 and the teachings of Boe, Figure 4, as applied by the Examiner (at page 2 of the Office Action), consider the following analysis:

1. Method for processing a client session request, comprising the steps of:

Examiner: client session request is line A, which
is from TN3270 Client to TN3270 Server.

Note that the client session request
originates in the TN3270 Client.

**negotiating environment parameters for establishing a
connection-oriented connection with said client;**

Examiner: line B, which is between TN3270 Client
and TN3270 Server.

inviting said client to submit user variables;

Examiner: line C, which is from TN3270 server to
Host.

This introduces the additional level of
indirection referred to previously, and
from now on communications are between
TN3270 Server and Host, and not between
the TN3270 Server and TN3270 Client.

responsive to receiving a user variable requesting a

custom confirmation record, sending to said client a confirmation record and custom record data.

Examiner: line E.

Applicants traverse on this critical point. The custom record data (line E) is not returned to the client as asserted by the Examiner, but rather to the TN3270 server. Thus, in Boe, the confirmation record and custom record data are not returned to the TN3270 Client, as is required by applicants' claims.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to more specifically recite the relative positions of the server and client in executing the steps of the claim.

With respect to claim 18, the Examiner rejects for reasons similar to those presented for claim 1. Applicants traverse.

Boe does show a client and server, but there is not

teaching of the exit program communicating information back to the client. Boe Figure 4 shows responses flowing from the host to the server, but no such flow on to the client. Thus, Boe does not enable the client to act on any response from the host or the server.

With respect to claims 2 and 3, applicants traverse the Examiner's characterization and application of Boe. Applicants claims 2 and 3 are similar to Boe in that normal TCP/IP connection establishment occurs. However, the negotiation for the confirmation record response does not occur here, for Boe (Col. 3, line 25) refers to line C in Figure 3. Instead, this request for confirmation record occurs in Boe in Fig. 4, lines C and D, which do not correspond to line C in Figure 3. Line H in Fig. 3 does show a response, but this not a confirmation record response. It is possible the Examiner intended to cite Line E in Fig. 4 as the confirmation record response (ACTLU x), but as is clear from the figure, this response goes to the TN3270 server, and not to the TN3270 client.

With respect to claims 4-6, applicants traverse the Examiner's rejection. As previously argued, the responses cited by the Examiner are fed to the TN3270 server and, most

importantly, not to the TN3270 client. Applicants agree that Boe has his version of a confirmation record, but argue that Boe does not teach that the confirmation record is accessible to the intended client.

With respect to claims 7-8, applicants traverse. As stated before, the Boe responses go to the TN3270 server and not to the TN3270 client.

With respect to claims 9-12, and 17, applicants traverse. As stated before, the Boe responses go to the TN3270 server and not to the TN3270 client.

With respect to claims 19, 20 and 22, which have been rejected for reasons similar as for claims 1-8 and 18, applicants again traverse. Again, Boe is using his TN3270 server as the "client" in his architecture. The fact that the server is performing the actions described gives no advantage as set forth in applicants claims to the TN3270 client that connects to the TN3270 server.

With respect to claims 23, 32, 49, 58, 63, 71, 88, 105, and 106, all other independent claims in the case, applicants traverse the Examiner's characterization of Boe's

teachings, which are asserted by the Examiner for similar reasons as for claim 1, and respond thereto as above for claim 1.

With respect to claims 33-34, 59-60, 64-65, 72-73, and 89-90, applicants traverse the Examiner's characterization and application of Boe. Applicants claims 2 and 3 are similar to Boe in that normal TCP/IP connection establishment occurs. However, the negotiation for the confirmation record response does not occur here, for Boe (Col. 3, line 25) refers to line C in Figure 3. Instead, this request for confirmation record occurs in Boe in Fig. 4, lines C and D, which do not correspond to line C in Figure 3. Line H in Fig. 3 does show a response, but this not a confirmation record response. It is possible the Examiner intended to cite Line E in Fig. 4 as the confirmation record response (ACTLU x), but as is clear from the figure, this response goes to the TN3270 server, and not to the TN3270 client.

With respect to claims 35-37, 61-62, 66-68, 74-76, 91-93, applicants traverse and argue, as asserted with respect to claims 4-6, that the responses cited by the Examiner are fed to the TN3270 server and, most importantly, not to the

TN3270 client. Applicants agree that Boe has his version of a confirmation record, but argue that Boe does not teach that the confirmation record is accessible to the intended client.

With respect to claims 38-39, 69-70, 77-78, and 94-95, applicants traverse and argue, as with respect to claims 7-8, that the Boe responses go to the TN3270 server and not to the TN3270 client.

With respect to claims 40-43, 48, 79-82, 87, 96-99, and 104, applicants traverse and argue, as with respect to claims 9-12 and 17, that the Boe responses go to the TN3270 server and not to the TN3270 client.

Applicants have amended all of the independent claims 1, 18, 23, 32, 49, 58, 63, 71, 88, 105, and 106 to further clarify the operation of the client and server, and urge that the rejection of these claims over Boe be reconsidered and withdrawn, and these claims allowed.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 13-16, 21, 44-47, 83-86, 100-103 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Boe et al, 6,122,276 (Boe hereafter) in view of Green et al, 6,003,084 (Green hereafter).

Applicants traverse the rejection of these dependent claims, first for the reasons stated above with respect to their respective base claims, and second for the following reasons.

Green describes a proxy that sits between a client and a server. The function of that proxy is to add additional checks before allowing the client to connect to the server. Such checks include determining if the client is "allowed" in, or to add additional filtering of clients based on some arbitrary criteria.

However, since the Green proxy requires that the client first attempt a connection to the server and also see the response from the server, the teachings of the Green patent cannot apply to or be combined with Boe. This is because Boe works on the TN3270 server and legacy host connection

interaction, and failure responses of the types applicants claim are not sent to the TN3270 client of Boe - they only go to the TN3270 server in Boe and therefore, in a combination of Boe and Green, stay on the server side of the Green proxy. Therefore, no proxy as described by Green is able to inspect any confirmation record responses for a server, for the Boe reference does not teach giving such responses to the combined proxy/client of Green -- such are held and acted on at the server (in the host/server connection). Thus, were one of ordinary skill in the art to examine the Green and Boe references together, he would find no teaching suggesting how they could be combined in the manner asserted by the Examiner.

Applicants, therefore, urge that the rejection of claims 13-16, 21, 44-47, 83-86, 100-103 be reconsidered and withdrawn, and these claims allowed.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION


Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1-106.

The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the Application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

R. G. Hartmann, et al.

By


Shelley M Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 22 Feb 2005

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Attorney at Law
61 Glenmont Road
Woodlawn, VA 24381-1341

Phone: (276) 238-1972
Fax: (276) 238-1545